

Remarks

I. Support for the Amendments

Support for the foregoing amendments to the claims may be found throughout the specification as originally filed, either inherently or explicitly. Specifically, support for the amendment to independent claims 46-49 can be found in the specification at page 23, line 6 through line 29. Hence, the foregoing amendments to the claims do not add new matter, and their entry into the present application is respectfully requested.

II. Status of the Claims

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 46-52, and 54 are pending in the application, with claims 46-49 being the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

III. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action dated July 9, 2004, the Examiner has made two rejections of the claims. Applicants respectfully offer the following remarks concerning each of these elements of the Office Action.

IV. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Is Traversed

In section 2 of the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner has rejected claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In making the rejection, the Examiner contends that "while the specification discloses some of the claimed agents immobilized, it does not disclose aminoguanidine on a solid support." Office Action at page 2. However, the present specification clearly discloses aminoguanidine immobilized on a solid support. Specifically, aminoguanidine is described in the specification as one of the inhibitors, blockers, reducing agents and binding agents used in the present methods. *See, e.g.*, specification at page 19, lines 3-15. Furthermore, the specification indicates that "one or more of the above-described inhibitors, blockers, reducing agents or binding agents . . . may be immobilized on a solid support to form an 'active solid support.'" Specification at page 23, lines 6-10. Therefore, taken together, the present specification clearly describes the immobilization of aminoguanidine on a solid support.

Hence, based on information that is clearly taught in the present specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood Applicants to have been in possession of the claimed invention when the present application was filed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, are respectfully requested.

V. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Is Accommodated

In section 3 of the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner has rejected claims 46, 49-51, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerami et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,758,583) (Doc. "A" cited on the Form PTO-892; hereinafter "Cerami") in view of alleged applicants' admissions. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. By not rejecting claim 53 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner has tacitly but directly acknowledged that Cerami does not render obvious the use of "at least one

agent that is immobilized on a solid support," as recited in claim 53. Hence, to expedite prosecution of the present application, and not in acquiescence to this rejection, claims 46-49 have been amended to incorporate the language of claim 53, such that each of these claims now recites the use of "at least one agent that is immobilized on a solid support." Therefore, the rejection has been overcome, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

VI. Other Matters

Applicants respectfully assert that generic claims 46 and 49, and dependant claim 51 (encompassing the elected species, aminoguanidine), are allowable in view of the remarks contained above and elsewhere herein. Claim 52 is drawn to the use of 1,2-phenylenediamine, and depends ultimately from claims 46 and 49. Thus, claims 46 and 49 represent allowable generic claims that link claim 52 and the elected species recited in claim 51. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claim 52 be rejoined and examined with the remaining claims, and that this claim be allowed. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.141(a) and 1.146, and MPEP § 809.02(c)(B).

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that generic claim 46 and dependant claim 49 (encompassing the elected species, beer) are allowable, in view of the remarks contained above and elsewhere herein. Claims 47 and 48 are drawn to contacting the inhibiting agent with a malt (claim 47) or a wort (claim 48), and depend ultimately from claim 46. Thus, claim 46 represents an allowable generic claim that links claims 47 and 48 and the elected species recited in claim 49. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 47 and 48 also be rejoined and examined with the remaining claims, and that these claims be allowed. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.141(a) and 1.146, and MPEP

§ 809.02(c)(B).

VII. Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Brian J. Del Buono
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,473

Date: Nov. 9, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600